DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 270 RC 006 951

AUTHOR	Pierce, James M.
TITLE	The Condition of Farm Workers and Small Farmers. Report to the National Board of National Sharecroppers Fund and Rural Advancement Fund.
INSTITUTION	National Sharecroppers Fund, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	14p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Agricultural Laborers; *Economic Disadvantagement; *Farm Labor; Farm Labor Legislation; Housing Needs; Migrant Worker Projects; Racial Discrimination; *Reports; *Rural Population; Sharecroppers; Welfare Problems

ABSTRACT

Discrepancies in the U.S. Department of Agriculture (one of America's largest industries) and its relationship to farmworkers and small farmers are discussed in this report. Statistics supporting this are: (1) although 60% of all substandard housing is in rural areas, less than 25% of all Federal housing has been allocated for these areas; (2) approximately 50% of the nation's poor live in rural areas, and 70% of these individuals survive on less than $2,000 per year; (3) almost half of America's 2.7 million farmers earned less than $2,500 in 1972; and (4) the average annual wage for 270,000 migratory laborers was $1,830, while the average farmworker earned $3,170. All these figures are well below the Federal poverty standard. The discussion focuses on achieving rural revitalization through a comprehensive Federal policy which would maintain a common direction in its programs and provide for coordination and cooperation between governmental agencies. Other topics included in this discussion on the indifference of large corporate farming are the land-grant university's concern with industry rather than farmers and racial discrimination in the Extension Service. A related document is ED 054 885. (NBC)

ED 076270

THE CONDITION OF FARMWORKERS AND SMALL FARMERS

REPORT TO THE NATIONAL BOARD
by James M. Pierce, Executive Director
NATIONAL SHARECROPPERS FUND and
RURAL ADVANCEMENT FUND

RECEIVED
JUN 11 1973
WMSU
E.R.I.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF ALL AGRICULTURAL LABOR
NSF
SINCE 1937

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

"Had me a farm sitting pretty on the hill. But, if you look, you'll see it ain't there still."

-The Pigeon Song "America"

In early January, 1973, a United States Congressman, reflecting on the latest incursions of agribusiness and the overall state of American agriculture, called for legislation protecting the family farmer as an endangered species. As in every year since 1940, the number of family farmers decreased—by 44,700 in 1972.[1] Over 850 a week went out of business in 1972, and for every six or seven farms that folded, one small rural business closed its doors.[2] Farmland communities across the nation disappeared as 800,000 Americans left rural areas in 1972 for urban and suburban life. For those left behind, the millions of migratory workers, small farmers, and hired farmworkers, it is more of the same—low wages, high unemployment, shabby housing, and poverty.

Nationally, some 60 percent (4.8 million units) of all substandard housing is in the countryside. Yet, because of current preoccupation with urban problems, less than 25 percent of all federal housing has gone to rural areas.

Fifty percent of the nation's poor live in rural areas, and 70 percent of the rural poor struggle to survive on less than $2,000 per year. Some 1,072,000 small farmers, almost half of America's 2.7 million farmers, earned less than $2,500 in 1972. The average annual wage for 270,000 migratory laborers was $1,830, while the average hired farmworker earned $3,170.[3] All these earnings figures are well below the federal poverty standard.

In an age of universal education, nearly half of all farm residents, aged 25 or over, have only eight years of education or less.[4] More than 700,000 adults in rural America have never been enrolled in school, and more than 19 million have never completed high school.

These are the human costs of the complex $130 billion-a-year American food industry—the nation's largest employer, employing one out of every seven Americans.[5]

1. Number of Farms and Farm Lands, USDA Release, January 12, 1973
2. *Christian Science Monitor*, August 30, 1972
3. U.S. Department of Agriculture
4. "Outlook for Rural Manpower Development," an address by Daniel W. Sturt, Director, Rural Manpower Service, U.S. Department of Labor, February 25, 1971
5. *The Farm Index*, USDA, July, 1972, p. 5

"Agricultural policy should be directed toward maintaining agriculture as a viable industry and not as a way of life."

-Young Executives Committee of USDA, 1972

Sitting atop America's largest industry is the United States Department of Agriculture--83,000 employees spread across the land, in 16,000 offices, with an $11 to $12 billion annual budget. Within this bureaucracy is a group of young USDA officials called the Young Executives Committee, established by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1727 of April 26, 1971.[5] Late in May, 1972, a strategy paper, *New Directions for U.S. Agricultural Policy*, prepared by the Young Executives Committee, surfaced in Washington and gave nightmares to many a farm leader.

With computer-like indifference, the Committee concluded that "the number of farms or the farm population is irrelevant except as these influence performance of the agriculture industry."[7] The study further recommended a phase-out of all farm price-support programs, including loans and purchases. As a result of this phase-out, a $6 billion decline in farm income was forecast.[8] To meet the food and fiber requirements of the nation in a more effective and efficient fashion, the Young Executives speculated on the reduction of America's farms from 2.7 million to 600,000.[9] These 600,000, of course, would be highly mechanized efficient business operations, while the other 2.1 million presumed inefficient ex-farmers would be shunted off to non-farm employment or perhaps provided for by a family assistance plan for busted farmers.[10]

Although Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Richard Lyng stated that the report had "no official status", its proposals are markedly similar to the phase-outs and cut-backs ordered by Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz in late December, and to the Administration's proposed 1973 agricultural budget.

6. *Congressional Record*, June 21, 1972, p. H5885
7. *Ibid*., p. H5886
8. *Ibid*., p. H5887
9. *Ibid*., p. H5910
10. *Ibid*., p. H5911

"If rural revitalization is to be achieved, a comprehensive federal policy must be established and implemented..."

-Senator John L. McClellan

In the absence of a coherent comprehensive rural policy, the federal government provides a range of services, or disservices, to small farmers and farm laborers. On the one hand the federal government offers price support and crop subsidies, and yet, through a federally-funded 38-state network of farm labor offices, workers are knowingly referred to farms that violate minimum federal standards for housing, sanitary conditions, and wages. Even those federal programs specifically charged with the responsibility of improving the lives of migrant and seasonal farmworkers have been found wanting.

A General Accounting Office report published in February, 1973, declared the programs of the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity had had little appreciable impact on the lives of millions of farmworkers. The report noted that while the government had spent in excess of $650 million in grants and loans to individuals and organizations working with migrant and seasonal farmworkers in the areas of housing, health, manpower training, and education, the farmworkers themselves were for the most part still ill housed, poorly educated, and untrained and received inadequate medical treatment.[11]

Despite a Department of Agriculture estimate that 800,000 fewer farmworkers will be required by 1975, the

11. Total expenditures compiled for fiscal years 1966-71 with fiscal 1972 computed on the total based on 1971 spending level

report noted, federal efforts to retrain workers for non-agricultural employment, where such programs existed, were not effective; for the most part, retraining projects did not exist at all.[12]

While the Office of Education sponsors special education programs for migrant children, the General Accounting Office evaluation of these programs showed: (1) migrant children were not achieving at grade level in reading, mathematics, or language skills; (2) educational deficiencies tended to increase as the students moved to higher grades; (3) required annual evaluations of migrant education programs either were not done or were inadequate; and (4) after six years of operation, school officials have yet to determine the best curricula or teaching methods for migrant children.[13]

Since 1962, when the Farm Labor Housing Loan and Grant Program was first enacted, the Farmers Home Administration has committed $31 million to finance housing for 4,700 families and 3,456 individuals.[14] Over a ten-year period, this amounts to a yearly average of 470 families and 345 individuals for whom housing has been provided, out of a total migrant and seasonal farmworker population numbering in the millions.

Incredibly, in fiscal years 1966 through 1971, the Farmers Home Administration spent only $17 million of the $66 million authorized for its housing *loan* program. And, during the same fiscal years, the Farmers Home Administration spent only $15 million of the $19 million of *grant* funds appropriated for housing.[15] When questioned by the Government Accounting Office as to why the money was not spent for housing, Farmers Home administrators, at both county and national levels, stated that they made little or no effort to promote improvement in farmworker housing; it was up to the community to seek out the Farmers Home Administration programs, and no funding initiative was taken until a sponsor requested a project.[16]

The findings of the Government Accounting Office, couched to be sure in its customary vague language, include: the programs lack a common direction; there is little coordination and cooperation between the agencies of government; in the final analysis, the programs have had a limited impact.

If the housing, education, health, and job training programs have had limited impact in the past, these programs will be fortunate to survive in the future. Beginning in late December, 1972, the Nixon Administration announced sweeping budget cutbacks aimed at dismantling much of the social legislation of the 1960s. All housing subsidy funds for the Farmers Home Administration and Housing and Urban Development

12. *Report to the Congress*, "Impact of Federal Programs to Improve the Living Conditions of Migrants and Other Seasonal Farmworkers," February 6, 1973, pp. 26-27
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28
14. *Ibid.*, p. 32
15. *Ibid.*, p. 33
16. *Ibid.*, p. 18

have been frozen; the Office of Economic Opportunity is to be abolished; job training programs are reduced; farm subsidy payments are phased out. The elimination of the Office of Economic Opportunity alone will eliminate 184,000 jobs at the local level throughout the nation. The Administration's budget seriously neglects, in general, the needs and aspirations of many American people; it is particularly neglectful of the needs of the rural poor.

If America's seasonal farmworkers and migrants receive little direct benefit from government programs, they receive even less relief from federal labor legislation, for they are largely exempt from federal statutes governing wages, overtime pay, unemployment insurance, collective bargaining, and most state workmen's compensation statutes. Even the President's 1971 Manpower Report states that the historic reasons for excluding farmworkers from protective legislation — administrative complexities and cost to small farmers — no longer exist because of the trend toward consolidation in agriculture and the growth of agribusiness.

In 1972, only 535,000 of the estimated 2.5 million farmworkers were covered by the federal minimum wage.[17] It is estimated that 800,000 children are employed in commercial agriculture. However, growers employing migrant and seasonal farmworkers seldom comply with federal and state laws prohibiting employment of children during school hours or in hazardous occupations. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare found that 800 deaths and 800,000 injuries occur annually from the use of agricultural pesticides. Department of Labor statistics show that agriculture ranks second only to construction in the number of job-related deaths. Yet farmworkers constitute the largest population group that is mostly excluded from coverage under state workmen's compensation laws. Every major job classification in private industry is covered by unemployment insurance, except farmwork. Farmworkers have been exempt from provisions of the National Labor Relations Act since its enactment in 1935. This exemption does not deny farmworkers the right to unionize, but it does *not* provide either federal protection of this right or federal enforcement of bargaining rights for farmworkers.

In 1972, America's farmworkers continue to be consistently and systematically excluded from the protection of labor laws afforded to other working people. There is something ironic about a national policy that provides price supports, tax write-offs, and free technology to the landed and then denies basic rights and equal protection to those who harvest our food. Despite ineffective government programs, inadequate legislation, and poverty wages, less than nine percent of migrant families apply for welfare.[18]

17. *Ibid.*, p. 23

18. *Ibid.*, p. 23

". . . integration from seedling to the supermarket."

-Report to the Stockholders, Tenneco, Inc.

General Eisenhower, upon retiring from the Presidency, warned the American people of the military-industrial complex, a cozy relationship between the Pentagon and the producers of military hardware, which at best results in cost over-runs for corporations and executive washroom keys for retired generals, and may at worst be responsible for a Vietnam. There is more than a little evidence that a similar relationship exists between government and the producers of America's food, a phenomenon Senator Stevenson has labeled agri-government.[19] Clearly, the drastic transformation of rural America in the past 25 years could not have come about without the complicity of government.

A classic scenario of agri-government which critics have called "The Great American Grain Robbery" was played out in the summer and fall of 1972. It was the American-Russian wheat deal. In September, 1972, CBS News revealed the details of how six large grain companies, with inside knowledge of the Soviet demand for American wheat, pocketed some $129 million in extra federal subsidies, while the small wheat farmers of the Southwest lost between $68 and $100 million in federal subsidies because they sold their wheat before the Soviet deal had pushed up the price of wheat.[20] The CBS investigation also pointed out that Clarence Palmby, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for International Affairs and intimately involved in the negotiations with the Russians, resigned from the Department of Agriculture to accept a vice presidency with Continental Grain Company. In less than thirty days after Palmby joined Continental Grain, the company sold 150 million bushels of grain to the Russians, the largest single transaction of the entire wheat deal.[21]

It is not the small farmer and farm laborer who benefit from the grain decisions of agri-government. It is agribusiness. While the Department of Agriculture is quick to point out that corporate farms constitute only one percent of all commercial farmers and control only an estimated 7 percent of the land, it is now believed that .09 percent of the nation's farms account for up to one-third of all farm sales.[22] If the Department of Agriculture has its way, this share of the market will increase.

19. *Farmworkers in Rural America*, Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Part I, p. 4
20. CBS Evening News, September 27, 1972
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Christian Science Monitor*, August 30, 1972

At a Department of Agriculture Conference on Agricultural Trends to 1985, a USDA spokesman estimated that by 1985 those farms with gross sales of $20,000 or more will capture 90 percent of the market. In 1972, only 12.2 percent of America's farms fell into this supersize category.[23] In the Alice-in-Wonderland world of agricultural planners, the American farm is transformed into ten-mile long fields, leveled by nuclear explosions, planted by computer programs, and harvested by plants genetically altered to yield their crops onto conveyor belts. The family farmer and the farmworker do not fit into the agribusiness configuration. This type of farming is big business requiring massive infusions of capital, concentrated marketing, and up-to-the-minute technology.

1985 is not too far away in some parts of the country. In California, Texas, Arizona, Florida, and to a lesser degree other parts of the nation, vertically integrated corporate agriculture is a fact. Such industrial giants as Boeing, Dow Chemical, Tenneco, Coca Cola, and Standard Oil exercise considerable corporate control of the marketplace. Green Giant claims 25 percent of all U.S. canned corn and peas; Ralston-Purina sells 14 percent of all livestock feed.[24] Ninety-five percent of the broilers, 75 percent of processed vegetables, 70 percent of citrus, 55 percent of turkeys, 40 percent of potatoes, 33 percent of fresh vegetables are grown under vertically integrated contracts to major U.S. corporations.[25]

For those farmers who, in the words of Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, do not "adapt or die", the option is to be reduced to being contract laborers. Secretary Butz, who has spent a lifetime jumping back and forth between positions at land-grant colleges, on agribusiness boards, and in the upper echelons of USDA, argues that America needs agribusiness to supply more food at lower costs.[26] Agribusiness, with its technological gadgetry, is presumed more efficient, yet even the government's own studies show that family farms ranging from 60 to 100 acres, depending on crop and location, are every bit as efficient as larger-sized farms.[27] Certainly, this presumed efficiency is not reflected at the checkout counter. On the contrary, a recent Federal Trade Commission inquiry found that American consumers are overcharged by 20 percent for their breakfast cereal, 90 percent of which is produced by four giant companies – General Mills, Kellogg's, General Foods, and Quaker Oats.[28]

If, then, agribusiness is not the model of efficiency, perhaps its virtue lies in producing better quality. But even the USDA admits that the average American eats a less nutritious diet than fifteen years ago.[29] The same

23. *Agriculture Statistics*, 1972, p. 565
24. *Christian Science Monitor*, August 29, 1972
25. *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times*, Agribusiness Accountability Project, p. 7
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 161-164
27. *Who Owns the Land?*, Peter Barnes and Terry Casalino, p. 5
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Ibid.*

folks who brought us the genetically rebuilt, mechanically harvested tomato are now busily attempting to put back the flavor and nutrients.

Little of the great wealth produced by American agriculture stays in rural America. On average, only 40 cents of every food dollar goes to the farmer. The small family farmer and farm laborer get even less. The rest flows into corporate board rooms in New York, Chicago, Atlanta, and San Francisco.

Even the farm subsidy payments designed to bolster the income of farmers are diverted to the corporate giants. In 1972, federal subsidy payments under the feed grain program jumped 77 percent over 1971 to $1.8 billion.[30] Despite Congressional reform of the program, distortions in federal subsidy payments continue: only 7.1 percent of the nation's farms—those with sales of over $40,000 a year—collected 40.3 percent of the farm subsidies, while 41.2 percent of the farms—those with sales of less than $2,500—received 5.3 percent of the federal subsidies.[31]

It is not only money that flows from rural America. With 70 percent of the population packed into 2 percent of the land, rural America is being transformed into a wasteland of dying towns, shabby houses, and boarded-up businesses.

As Peter Barnes, West Coast editor of the New Republic, has observed, the ultimate victim of corporate agriculture may be the land.[32] Extensive use of monoculture, pesticides, and inorganic fertilizers by giant corporate farms depletes the soil, necessitating even larger quantities of chemicals to "enrich" the soil and reduce pests, which leads to further depletion. Until 1972, farmers were dumping 12 million pounds of DDT annually on their crop land—a practice critics fear may have destroyed vast areas of farmland.[33]

". . . no part of the land-grant university is a welfare agency."

-John T. Caldwell, Chancellor, North Carolina State University

In May, 1972, one of agriculture's sacred cows, the land-grant college complex, was led to slaughter. In a book-length report, *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times*, the research-oriented Agribusiness Accountability Project charged that the land-grant colleges are diverting millions of dollars of tax money, intended to help the entire rural

30. *Congressional Record*, March 20, 1973, p. H1953
31. *Washington Evening Star*, March 13, 1973
32. *Who Owns the Land?*, p. 5
33. *Christian Science Monitor*, August 28, 1972

community, to support of research and service activities that principally benefit agribusiness. The pressing needs of small farmers, farm laborers, and other rural residents are ignored. Today's urban crisis, the report charges, is a consequence of failure in rural America, and no single institution has "played a more crucial role in that failure" than the land-grant college.[34]

As examples of the distorted priorities of the land-grant college system, *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times*, cites the following:

> "The complex has been eager to work with farm machinery manufacturers and well-capitalized farming operations to mechanize all agricultural labor, but it has accepted no responsibility for the farm laborer who is put out of work by the machine. It has worked hand-in-hand with seed companies to develop high-yield seed strains, but it has not noticed that rural America is yielding up practically all of its young people. It has been available day and night to help non-farming corporations develop schemes of vertical integration, while offering independent family farmers little more comfort than 'adopt or die.' It has devoted hours to create adequate water systems for fruit and vegetable processors and canners, but 30,000 rural communities still have no central water systems. It has tampered with the gene structure of tomatoes, strawberries, asparagus, and other foods to prepare them for the steel grasp of the mechanical harvesters, but it has sat still while the American food supply has been liberally laced with carcinogenic substances."[35]

Throughout interviews with USDA officials and professors at land-grant universities, the Agribusiness Accountability Project people were told that multimillion-dollar agribusiness could not perform its own research and development. Thus, the industry must turn to tax-supported universities. For the large and the powerful in agriculture, public research is an investment; for the small farmer, the farm laborer, and the poor, public research is welfare.

34. Agribusiness Accountability Project Press Release, May 31, 1972

35. *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times*, pp. 8-9

"Discrimination in the Extension Service remains a major problem on the Department of Agriculture's docket."

-U.S. Civil Rights Commission, January, 1973

Although the Department of Agriculture took major steps in 1972 to implement goals and timetables for minority participation in its programs, discrimination appears to continue in the Extension Service. In the 1973 Budget hearings, it was noted that minorities constituted approximately 8 percent of the more than 11,000 county and area extension agents; slightly less than 2 percent of the more than 4,200 state and area specialists; and slightly more than 2 percent of the more than 1,000 administrative and supervising personnel.[36] The Civil Rights Commission has repeatedly criticized the Extension Service for its failure to take action against states found in noncompliance, but the pattern continues.

It has been almost twenty years since *Brown v. Board of Education* outlawed the separate but equal practice in American public education, yet seventeen separate and unequal land-grant colleges are maintained in the South and border states. The colleges of 1890, as they are called, are blatantly discriminated against in the allocation of Department of Agriculture funds. Peter H. Schuck, in an unpublished paper, "Black Land-Grant Colleges: Separate and Still Unequal", found that "of the approximately $76,800,000 in USDA funds allocated to these schools, about 99.5 percent went to the white land-grant colleges; the 1890 colleges received a grand total of $383,000 (or 0.5 percent)." In 1971, less than one percent of the research money distributed by Cooperative State Research Service in Southern and border states went to black schools. In fiscal 1972, they upped the funding of the 1890 colleges to $12.8 million.[37]

Discrimination in the Department of Agriculture and in the land-grant college system is particularly damaging—for it often means that black farmers are denied basic information that might otherwise be available. It may mean, too, that the quality of financial and technical assistance provided may be inferior to that furnished the white farmer. In the case of the colleges of 1890, it clearly means that, until 1972, the discriminating allocation of USDA funds greatly inhibited the ability of these colleges to perform. In any event, discrimination is alive and well down on the farm.

36. *The Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort—A Reassessment*, January 1973, p. 244

37. *Farmworkers in Rural America*, Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Part 4B, p. 2764

"I never saw a banker yet who didn't have a keen eye for opportunity - and Rural Development is ripening day by day."

-Earl Butz, October 10, 1972

Skyrocketing food prices, typhoid outbreaks in migrant labor camps, a concern for clean environment and wholesome food, and a Presidential campaign served to focus America's attention in 1972 on rural America. Beyond the heat and rhetoric, the real question remains – who will control rural America in general, and farming in particular? Secretary of Agriculture Butz claims to be an advocate, a protector, of the family farm; yet, the efforts of the Department of Agriculture appear to bolster agribusiness at the expense of the rural population.

Several legislative attempts to answer the question of rural America were undertaken in 1972. Senator Gaylord Nelson (D-Wisc.) introduced the Family Farm Act in an attempt to drive corporate farming from agriculture. By amending the Clayton Anti-Trust Act, the Nelson bill would require any individual or corporation with more than $3 million in non-farm enterprises or more than $1 million of stock or shares in one or more businesses to divest itself of all agricultural holdings. Farmers' cooperatives and charitable and nonprofit research groups would be excluded.

Another attempt to strike at the heart of corporate farming was the Reclamation Land Authority Act, sponsored by Senator Fred Harris (D-Okla.), which would enforce the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902 limiting to 160 acres the amount of land for which a landowner can receive federally irrigated water. Under the Harris bill, excess land would be purchased by the federal government at pre-irrigation prices and sold or leased at post-irrigation prices, with profits used for education, conservation, and programs for the economically disadvantaged.

Both the Harris proposal and the Nelson Family Farm bill died with the 92nd Congress. But, with the Farm Act of 1970 due to expire in June, 1973, Congress will certainly have occasion to consider the future of rural America.

The much-touted billion-dollar effort – the Rural Development Act of 1972 – signed by the President in August, 1972, and acclaimed by Senator Humphrey as the Magna Carta for rural America, has turned out to be a $333 million limited-ceiling program to "test policies,

criteria, procedures, and coordinating mechanisms during fiscal year 1974."[38] In many respects rural development remains a political slogan as it fails to deal with the fundamental issue of farmers' income — the critical factor in a revitalized rural America.

Political slogans and a piecemeal approach to the problems of small farmers and farm laborers are nothing short of cruel deception. Rural life need not be marked by extreme poverty and hardship. The technology which now benefits corporate giants and many urban areas can be adapted to rural America, provided a national commitment is made. The remedies and technology exist. It is the policy that is missing — a policy supported by legislation that would:

- Bar giant corporations from agriculture.
- Provide adequate and equitable labor legislation for farmworkers.
- Return the crop subsidy program to its original purpose of helping small farmers and farmworkers to stay on the land.
- Close tax loopholes which encourage tax-loss farming and corporate gigantism.
- Encourage and assist cooperative development.
- Require USDA and land-grant colleges to extend research, technical assistance, and financial assistance to small farmers and cooperatives.
- Enforce the 160-acre limitation and residency requirements in federal land-reclamation areas.
- Develop comprehensive land-use and zoning plans for rural America.
- Increase the minimum wage for farmworkers and extend its coverage.
- Develop alternative land redistribution policies.

There are many organizations now at work on one or more of these solutions: *Cooperativa Campesina* in California is a successful strawberry cooperative organized by a group of Mexican-American farmworkers; New Communities, Inc., in Lee County, Georgia, has formed a 5,700-acre land trust; cooperative food-buying clubs have sprung up in many urban areas, many of them buying directly from farmer cooperatives; the National Farmers Organization has been quite successful in negotiating production contracts with food processors; the National Coalition for Land Reform is working for policy changes necessary for fundamental land reform; environmental organizations are fighting the spread of concrete and pollution; the National Sharecroppers Fund is active in developing and promoting rural cooperatives and in working for legislative change.

All these things and many others are in motion, and while the Jeffersonian view of rural America has irretrievably vanished, a continued push can break the dominance of agribusiness and agri-government, preserve rural life as an option for all Americans, provide an abundance of food produced in harmony with sound environmental practices, and contribute to a better rural and urban America.

38. Testimony of Agriculture Secretary Butz, Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, February 13, 1973

NATIONAL SHARECROPPERS FUND

- Promotes national legislation to benefit migrants and other farmworkers and small farmers.
- Works for administrative change in existing government programs to make them more responsive to the needs of rural poor people.
- Supports the efforts of farmworkers to organize and works to end their exclusion from the benefits of social legislation.

RURAL ADVANCEMENT FUND of NSF

- Encourages and supports rural economic development through cooperatives and other community organizations.
- Conducts educational programs to alert the public to the facts of rural poverty and programs needed to end it.
- Gives technical assistance to low-income rural people on health, housing, education, child care, and other self-help projects.

Contributions to RAF are tax-deductible.

NATIONAL SHARECROPPERS FUND/RURAL ADVANCEMENT FUND

1145 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
112 East 19th Street, New York, N.Y. 10003

NATIONAL BOARD

BENJAMIN E. MAYS, *chairman* — LUTHER H. FOSTER
A. PHILIP RANDOLPH, *vice chairman emeritus* — JAMES M. GODDIN
ROBERT S. BROWNE, *vice chairman* — LEODONNA HARRIS
REV. A.J. MCKNIGHT, *secretary-treasurer* — VIVIAN W. HENDERSON
SHIRLEY E. GREENE, *chairman of executive committee* — JOHN E.S. HOLLOWAY, M.D.
THOMAS C. BARNWELL, JR. — WILLIAM H. JOHNSON
D. MARSHALL BARRY — LEWIS W. JONES
JULIAN BOND — JAMES W. LEWIS
ROBERT COLES, M.D. — JAMES LIPSIC
MAX DELSON — JENNIFER E. LOWENSTEIN
IVANHOE DONALDSON — ROBERT J. MILES
EVELYN DUBROW — MORRIS MILGRAM
MARIAN WRIGHT EDELMAN — DANIEL H. POLLITT
GEORGE H. ESSER, JR. — ARTHUR F. RAPER
— VERA RONY
— PATRICIA CAYO SEXTON
— ROWLAND WATTS
— RAYMOND M. WHEELER, M.D.
— JAMES E. YOUNGDAHL

FOUNDING MEMBERS

FRANK P. GRAHAM — IRA DeA. REID
FRANK McCALLISTER — NORMAN THOMAS
ELIOT D. PRATT

JAMES M. PIERCE, *executive director* — FAY BENNETT, *resource development*
JOHN A. WILSON, *legislative director* — PATRIC MULLEN, *research director*

This pamphlet is printed on 100% recycled paper